

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/919,602	07/30/2001	Sudhakar Kasina	690022.525C7	3183
500	7590 11/05/2003		EXAM	INER
	LLECTUAL PROPERT	HARTLEY, MICHAEL G		
701 FIFTH A SUITE 6300	VE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SEATTLE, WA 98104-7092			1616	<del></del>

DATE MAILED: 11/05/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Eveniner Initiated Intensions Summans	09/919,602	KASINA ET AL.
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Michael G. Hartley	1616
All Participants:	Status of Application:	
(1) <u>Michael G. Hartley</u> .	(3)	
(2) Richard Sharkey (Appl. repr.).	(4)	
Date of Interview: 5 November 2003	Time:	
Type of Interview:	nt's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed:  Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	B DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
<ul> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary</li> </ul>	e examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
Mtl9 futty (Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/	Applicant's Representative Si	gnature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: A call was initiated to inform applicant's representative that the examiner has spoken to technology center (1600) interference specialist Michael Woodward concerning the request by applicant in the response filed 10/14/2003 that an interference be declared in the application. The interference specialist suggested this interview to inform said representative that the application may require consulation with the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences to declare the interference. Further notification will be forthcoming, accordingly, after said consultation takes place.